

**Lehi City Council Meeting
Minutes**

Tuesday, August 8, 2010 7:00 p.m. Council Chambers

Conducting: Mayor Bert Wilson
Present: Council members – James Dixon, Stephen Holbrook, Mark Johnson and Johnny Revill
Excused: Council member Kaye Collins
Press: Cathy Allred – Daily Herald

Public Hearing 7:00 p.m.

1. *Mountain Home Development – Request for approval of an amendment to the Traverse Mountain Area Plan, amending the Cresthaven Village Pod located at 2000 West Traverse Mountain Blvd. from a C (Commercial) to an HDR (High Density Residential) land use designation.*
 - A. *Approval of Ordinance*

Ted Heap appeared before the city council requesting the approval of an amendment to the Traverse Mountain Area Plan. Mr. Heap thanked the council for their time. He indicated that there is an exciting future for Traverse Mountain; they plan to generate a lot of activity. Jack Hepworth presented a power point showing the proposed units and 18 acre site. He indicated that Brad Reynolds – Developer of the River Walk is working on the project, the units will be 3 stories with garages on the bottom floor. The Clubhouse with pool and 2 spas will be managed by AMC. He reported that they are looking at a 14 month timeframe is approximately 2012.

Ted Heap indicated that they still have a lot of units to reach build-out on this project. Economic conditions are not allowing for much variation. Mr. Heap asked that in the motion if approved that an earmark of 100 percent of the impact fees be dedicated to park.

Roger Timmerman – HOA representative explained the history of the area. He indicated that the area plan for Cresthaven high density to commercial was with neighborhood opposition. The Council tabled for developer to meet with neighbors and come to some resolve. During that time the timelines, parks and amenities were the big issues. He felt that they were no further at this point than before. Mr. Timmerman read the minutes from previous city council meeting regarding the history of Traverse Mountain approvals and denials. He added that if the motion is to approve that the Park should also be part of that motion. He stated that the developer has met with HOA's and if a decision is made tonight please set time lines and anticipated results.

Spence Clark –expressed that a lot of people are concerned about apartments. He asked if anyone has done balloting or a survey to see how apartments affect the value of the existing property. He stressed that he doesn't want apartments there they would serve better and be a better fit across the street.

Eric Nicole – indicated that we are all tired of going over the same issues – over and over. He stated that they want better value and a better community and it seems what the community wants and the developer wants is different. They are asking the city to fulfill their commitments. He reported that a letter was sent to the mayor that he would like as part of the minutes. He asked the mayor to read the letter to the audience or put it in the minutes. He recommended denial of the request and to hold them to their commitments.

Letter Regarding Mountain Home Development Proposes Traverse Mountain Area Amendment & Rezoning request;

August 9, 2010

RE: Mountain Home Development Proposed Traverse Mountain Area Amendment & Rezoning Request

Dear Mayor Wilson:

*I am a resident of Traverse Mountain and understand that Mountain Home Development (MHD) will be asking the City Council for an amendment to rezone a key parcel of commercial land to high-density residential so that they can build HUD-financed apartments at the entrance of Traverse Mountain. Unfortunately, my family and I traveling are out-of-state this week and my wife Marianne and I won't be able to attend Tuesday's City Council Meeting. Consequently, **I'm writing to register our strong opposition to this proposal and urge you to reject MHD's request to place apartments on the front doorstep of the Traverse Mountain Community.***

This is an ill-conceived housing project placed in a poor location and is an attempt by MHD to make quick money without regard to the residents or impact on the community. Just because this is one of Mountain Home Development's only unencumbered pieces of property in Traverse Mountain doesn't make it a good location for apartments.

Wrong Community Welcome-Mat that Lowers Property Values. *Putting a large apartment complex at the main entrance of Traverse Mountain creates the wrong welcome mat for our community, lowers the property value of over 1200 homes, and completely ignores the broader planning impact that putting apartments in this location will have. There are numerous places in Traverse Mountain that are currently zoned for high-density housing and MHD should build suitable high-density housing (preferably owner-occupied) in one of these locations.*

Violates Lehi City Code. *Lehi City Development Code (Sec 06.160) specifically states that in a Planned Community Zone, the City Council can only approve a proposed change to an Area Plan if it meets several conditions:*

- A. That the granting of the variation will not adversely affect the rights of adjacent landowners or residents.*
- B. That the variation desired will not adversely affect the public health, safety or general welfare.*
- C. That the granting of the variation will not be opposed to the general spirit and intent of this Chapter or the General Plan.*

Traverse Mountain property values are dependent on MHD developing the community in a planned fashion in accordance with the Area Plan and “Planned Community” ordinances. Allowing MHD to significantly deviate from the Area Plan and place HUD-financed apartments in the front entrance of Traverse Mountain would “adversely affect the rights of adjacent landowners or residents,” by negatively impacting our property values. When MHD’s zoning request negatively impacts the value of Traverse Mountain residents, it is incumbent upon the City Council to deny this request. Furthermore, MHD’s proposal would add 340 apartments (which are in addition to the 143 townhomes that the city recently approved) in the next 12-18 months. Adding this many residences in such a short period of time to our community without significant advance planning with Alpine School District and Lehi City will also adversely affect our community’s general welfare by overcrowding our schools and one park. (Note – MHD just spoke to Alpine School District about these apartments a few weeks ago. This is not advanced planning!)

MHD convinced Traverse Mountain residents to buy homes in Traverse Mountain by selling their premium vision of a master-planned community filled with parks & open space, interconnected with trails, and located within walking distance to shopping. Many Traverse Mountain residents based their decision to buy a house in the community on the overall vision that MHD sold to them. MHD reaped substantial financial rewards by selling us on “Planned Community.” Allowing MHD to reap those rewards and then engage in a pattern of deviating from the Area Plan to the detriment of residents completely violates the “general spirit & intent” of the Planned Community provisions in the Development code. Because none of the above three Lehi Code requirements are met, Lehi City should deny the zoning change that MHD is requesting.

MHD makes five arguments in support of their rezoning proposal for HUD-financed apartments:

- 1. **Original Zoning:** MHD asserts that this land was originally zoned for high-density housing, so rezoning it back from commercial should be fine.*

Before the zoning was changed, MHD's sales representatives actively told prospective Traverse Mountain residents that this land would be used for owner-occupied townhomes. After rezoning the land to Commercial in 2007, this land was repositioned as a commercial area with Factory Outlets and places to eat and shop.

Bottom Line: When MHD needed to sell lots, it was never billed as high-density apartments as such a proposal would have been met with significant opposition from residents and would have caused prospective buyers to think twice.

2. ***Community Benefit:*** *They argue that adding "roof tops" will help attract additional commercial development into Traverse Mountain which will benefit the Traverse Mountain community.*

MHD has plenty of places to add "roof tops" in their current master plan. While finding commercial may take a little longer for MHD because they haven't been focused on it, we are confident that with the completion of SR-92 (routing thousands of cars past that property each day), the beginning of the factory outlets (which should start shortly), Cabellas' continued success (1.5M visitors/yr), and the filling in of additional businesses touted by MHD, MHD will be able to find partners and get financing for suitable commercial uses for this area.

As Mr. Richard Rose, a local commercial real-estate broker, stated at the Planning Commission meeting in July 2010, when he called Craig Realty about a commercial opportunity, he never received a call back. Others, including Alpine School District, have shared that MHD has unrealistic expectations for property values in Traverse Mountain and consequently noted they were extremely difficult to work with.

Perhaps if MHD realizes it will need to find a commercial project for this space, it will be more motivated to pursue commercial opportunities and find partners who return calls. While this process may take a little longer than the apartments, I believe in the long run it will be more beneficial to Traverse Mountain residents and Lehi City.

3. ***MHD Viability:*** *MHD needs this HUD-financed housing project to survive and enable it to meet its development commitments to residents.*

According to an affidavit filed by the person managing MHD's books, MHD paid its principals over \$1M in dividend payouts in 2008. Furthermore, according to legal pleadings, the Christensen's were offered over \$20M for their minority stake in MHD and Ted Heap has represented to investors and board members within the past 18 months that Traverse Mountain's valuation is about \$200M.

After reviewing the thousands of pages of legal pleadings in MHD's partnership dispute, it's clear that MHD has been able to find hundreds of thousands of dollars

to finance a prolonged legal battle between their partners. This is disappointing, as investing these resources into Traverse Mountain would have enabled MHD to meet their commitments to residents. That said it's clear that Mountain Home Development can find money to spend when it needs it.

It's important to note that the structure of this HUD-financed housing deal has MHD contributing only 10% (land as collateral) to this deal, making this project highly leveraged and providing them with little profits.

4. **Impact Fees:** *MHD's apartments will create \$1.2M in Park Impact fees that can be exclusively earmarked (districted) for Traverse Mountain and fund community amenities.*

MHD has recently courted Traverse Mountain residents by offering up the possibility that MHD can convince Lehi City to district the \$1.2M in impact fees created by their HUD-financed apartments to develop amenities in Traverse Mountain.

Lehi City should NOT allow this for the following reasons:

1. **Protecting Residents:** *Mountain Home Development is trying to enable further ad hoc changes to the area plan by conditioning their delivery of promised amenities on resident support for an ill-conceived HUD-financed apartment complex. This should NOT be allowed.*

*MHD following-through on contractually-obligated amenities in the Area Plan should be completely independent of this rezoning issue and Lehi City should not allow them to erroneously convince residents that they are somehow connected. **Lehi City needs to ensure that MHD delivers on its promises, and that MHD is not allowed to convince residents that community amenities are somehow contingent on residents' supporting MHD's proposed deviations to the area plan.***

2. **Bad Policy:** *While I would love the \$1.2M in Park Impact fees to be dedicated to Traverse Mountain, this sets a really bad precedent for Lehi City who relies on a 3-5 yr capital budgeting plan to fund parks and city amenities. Districting impact fees so they come back to directly benefit a developer sets a poor planning precedent that will haunt Lehi City for years to come and impair its longer-term planning capability.*

5. **Amenities:** *"If we identify park lands, we've come current on our park commitments and the rezoning request should be approved." I understand that in an effort to win residents approval of the zoning change, MHD is identifying 10.5 Acres of land very close to Eagle Summit Park that potentially could be used for an additional park.*

Last-minute heroic planning to identify a piece of land for a park fits within MHD's pattern of last-minute, ad hoc development and serves to create an illusion that there is a master plan in place within Traverse Mountain. Was this land designated as a public park in Traverse Mountain in the Area Plan? Why isn't there a clear plan for where & when land will be developed and handed-off to Lehi City for park development?

Furthermore, identifying (but not building) amenities is a tactic that MHD uses when they're trying to push their agenda forward. MHD needs to provide a comprehensive plan to Lehi City on how they plan to come current on their amenities and open space deficit in Traverse Mountain.

Again, Lehi City needs to stop MHD from suggesting that amenities are conditional on residents allowing detrimental zoning changes. The amenities are part of the area plan commitment and should not be conditional on residents supporting zoning changes that ultimately hurt them.

***Delinquent Area Plan Amenities:** MHD has completed building the residential portion of Phase 2 of the Traverse Mountain (Fox Hollow) Area Plan. As a result, before MHD moves into Phase 3 of residential, they need to come current on their Phase 2 amenities commitments (see Area Plan: Density & Intensity section, pg 3).*

According to our calculations, once there are 362 acres of residential built there should also be:

- 43 Acres of Schools
- 23.9 Acres of Public Parks
- 13 Acre Recreation Center
- 8 Acres of Churches (which are in)

*This is in addition to the 3.3 Acre private park with a Pool & Tennis complex that MHD promised residents and never delivered. Consequently, **MHD needs to implement 30 more acres of parks and fully comply with Lehi City's 10% Open Space ordinance to come current on their amenities obligations.***

Mountain Home Development's pattern of short-sighted, ad hoc "master" planning is part of a larger pattern of choosing to ignore their responsibilities as a Master Developer and selectively implementing portions of the Area Plan that financially enrich them, while completely ignoring their responsibilities to the Community, Lehi City, and Traverse Mountain residents.

*For the above reasons, **I'm asking you to direct Lehi City to immediately engage with MHD and address this long-pattern of broken promises and unmet commitments. I'm also asking that you deny MHD's proposed rezoning request – Lehi City has already provided MHD***

with adequate zoning for high-density housing in numerous locations throughout Traverse Mountain. Building HUD-financed apartments at the front entrance of Traverse Mountain creates the wrong focal point at the community entrance, degrades residential property values, and displaces much needed commercial development.

Unfortunately, Lehi City has allowed MHD to erode its premium master-planned community vision over the last several years by providing minimal oversight of their development activities and by not actively enforcing Lehi City Ordinance and the Area Plan Commitments. MHD has been allowed to minimize the development of parks, open space, amenities and commercial space while increasing high density housing and allowing an active mining operation in Fox Canyon, which creates a significant safety issue for kids going to school.

As you can see from the turnout at the City Council meeting in early July, Traverse Mountain residents are fed up with the string of MHD's broken promises and missed commitments. It is time for this to stop. MHD needs to stop viewing amenities as optional and Lehi City needs to enforce these as requirements for the right to act as the Master Developer in Traverse Mountain.

We appreciate your active engagement in this matter and urge you to send a strong message to Mountain Home Development on Tuesday by denying their rezoning request and communicating that Lehi City won't accept business as usual from MHD and plans to protect the residents in Traverse Mountain moving forward.

Stephanie Averams indicated that at a previous meeting she asked the Mayor and Council to ride by apartments and look at the sad sight. She expressed her concern for drugs and crime and asked that the council consider condos, townhomes or possibly twin-homes instead of apartments. She stated that another issue is that rooftops are needed to bring commercial and added that this is not true and urged the council to vote no.

Craig Hall – attorney, indicated that they have sent two letters opposing the area plan approval for Traverse Mountain. He stated that the Development Code 06.020 addresses this issue and will adversely affect the community. He indicated that it is the developer's burden to make sure all things are met and approved. He added that they have not heard from the developer nor have any studies or surveys on the effect of the apartments by decreasing property values been done and encouraged the council to deny.

Cindy Hancock thanked Mr. Clark (apartment Developer) for speaking out and stating his concern about apartments. She stressed that she has nothing against apartments but would like the area to remain commercial for the tax base. She indicated that they moved here for their children to be raised in a small town and asked that they put the apartments across the street where the others are located.

Mark Beauchene commented that in earlier approvals there was a timeline set for amenities and asked what happened to the timeline? He asked that the council deny until a timeline is presented.

Angie Parkin, noted that the letter from Rod Ludlow was very thorough. She felt that the developer is delinquent in their commitments and should have more built by this time. She recommended that they go back and do better with this project. She also felt that the park location chosen is the furthest away from 3 communities.

Zack Patterson reported that all of the HUD housing communities devalue property. He pointed out that he had already lost \$200,000 on his home and if HUD housing is approved it will be less. He urged the council to deny the request.

Corey Nielsen informed those present that the project is not a HUD housing project it is only government insured and has nothing to do with low income.

Ron Phillips agreed that it is not low income housing. He reported that the rent is \$800.00 to \$1400.00, which is the price that the large homes are renting for. He expressed his concern that when they can't fill them at that price they will lower them to compete with other rentals in the area.

Connor Boyack announced that he put a lot of time and energy to understand both sides of the issue. He indicated that being a representative of the HOA he felt that there are 3 tiers to making the decision; 1) constitution; 2) constituency; and 3) conscience. He noted that they have held some good meetings with Traverse Mountain and felt that they have some good ideas, but he still leans toward denial. He added that there are significant issues still to resolve and despite the proposal he has yet to see an overwhelming support for approval.

Rickie Kogger indicated that in the past 3 years their children have gone across town to Highland to go to school and felt that when the apartments come in the schools will be way over crowded. She recommended that the city deny the request.

Paul Hancock, addressed the overall impact of the residential properties, and property value comparisons. He compared a \$1.2 million dollar benefit to the community to \$11 million to property erosion. He thanked the Mayor and Council for their interest and to Ted and Jack for working toward coming to a conclusion that will be a good situation for all.

Tricia Melville affirmed that it is in all of our best interest for Traverse Mountain to succeed but again we do not have enough of the nitty gritty details to know if it will be. She expressed her appreciation for the communication with Traverse Mountain. She advised the city council to not change until there are more specific details.

Jim Conder indicated that he appreciates the freedom to speak. He expressed his concern that there are so many liens held on the property and that it may cause a chain reaction. He also noted that there is no guarantee on the apartments; he added that a different management can ruin an apartment very easily. He asked for the figures that show the property de-valuation. Mr. Conder

relayed that they would like to see Mountain Home Development succeed but recommends that it be looked at on a long term basis and encouraged the council to vote no.

Meagan Kennedy commented that this is a very complex issue. The more we talk about it and the more information given will help with the decision. She questioned if it stays commercial will anything happen. Mrs. Kennedy asserted that if the requirement were put in writing and more structured she could support the approval. She felt that there are other questions to be answered like - what is the alternative or what if Mountain Home Development falls apart.

Kasey lighten expressed her concern for the future of apartments. She felt that the developer needs to keep their promises and asked what teeth the council has to hold them accountable. He indicated that he opposes the proposed area plan.

Mayor Wilson closed the public hearing at 8:45 p.m.

Ted Heap pointed out that some of the information presented is not quite accurate. He stated that he doesn't know how the park and approval of the area plan is a bribe. He indicated that Traverse Mountain is willing to immediately donate the ground to Lehi City, generate park impact fees, build apartments and be proactive in changing the situation. Traverse Mountain is a beautiful community and we have a concrete solid way to fix anything that has happened. He committed to be more open. He indicated that he did not believe that this will affect property values that the diversity will create a rich community. He felt that the statement that rooftops don't matter is false – they do matter and Traverse Mountain is committed to create the density in the most pleasing way that they can.

Council member Revill inquired how soon this can happen.

Ted Heaps stated that they can only do what they can do. The proposed parcel has been identified on every plan as a park, and is free and clear. The money comes immediately at closing to the city to begin the park. The canal is being piped, but the Traverse Mountain portion will not be done until next summer. The park can begin as soon as next summer. If the city has the money the park can be built right away. He added that they are trying to turn around any negative from the past.

Council member Revill indicated that he bases his vote on his conscience and not a political issue. He stressed that whether we put high density in this spot or not it will come. The council has to determine if this spot is the best for the density. He explained that traffic is still a concern and he really wants to support commercial.

Council member Johnson reported that he took many hours putting together a historical document with the help of staff. He reiterated that this is not an election issue we need to consider the rights of the developer and the home owners. He indicated that he is a proponent of trying to work this issue out and both parties to be successful. Council member Johnson complimented Ted Heap and Jack Hepworth for doing a very good job trying to fix this situation.

Council member Holbrook indicated that this decision is about what is right. The cities obligation is to grow and develop. He stated that some people want to rent and move every three years. He thanked all who spoke for or against this issue but his decision will be based on common sense to him and not in opposition to anyone.

Council member Dixon asserted that the city is responsible and they have a responsibility to fix it. He stated that he has been with this project from the very beginning and seen all of the changes presented. His question is, "Is this appropriate planning according to planning standards and it is consistent.

Mayor Wilson indicated that there is no right or no wrong. There will be 7,700 units on the mountain rather we like it or not. We only want to do the right thing. He relayed that if he were allowed to vote he would vote his conscience by the way he feels and asked that there is support for those that vote tonight rather it be for or against you.

thanked all who spoke for or against this issue but his decision will be based on common sense to him and not in opposition to anyone.

Council member Dixon asserted that the city is responsible and we need to accept it especially in seeing that the amenities that were agreed upon are met and we have a responsibility to fix it. He stated that he has been with this project from the very beginning and seen all of the changes presented. His question is, "Is this appropriate planning according to planning standards and it is consistent

Mayor Wilson indicated that there is no right or no wrong. There will be 7,700 units on the mountain rather we like it or not. We only want to do the right thing. He relayed that he would vote his conscience by the way he feels and asked that there is support for those that vote tonight rather it be for or against you.

MOTION: a motion deny the Traverse Mountain request for an amendment to the Traverse Mountain Area Plan, amending the Cresthaven Village based on these technical findings;

- 1) The property is more suitable for commercial land use because of its location adjacent to Traverse Mountain Boulevard and Triumph Boulevard, both of which are arterial roads and its proximity to existing and planned retail development to the south and west.
- 2) The current request was recommended for denial by the Lehi City Planning Commission;
- 3) Mountain Home Development has failed to present the comprehensive area Plan amendments required pursuant to the #1 amendment to the Annexation and Development Agreement.
- 4) There are other areas within the existing Area Plan that are currently available and suitable for the type of HDR development proposed that could be utilized without reducing the amount of commercially designated areas in the Area Plan; and

5) Traverse Mountain has not met their schedule for construction of amenities required at this stage of development. Specifically, approximately 11 acres of public park property has not been developed as required by the Area Plan as amended was made by Council member Johnson, seconded by Council member Revill. Roll call vote: Revill-yes, Dixon-no, Johnson-yes, Holbrook-no, Collins-excused. Mayor broke tie with a no vote. Motion failed.

***MOTION:** a motion to approve the amendment to the Traverse Mountain Area Plan, amending the Cresthaven Village Pod located at 2000 West Traverse Mountain Blvd. from a C (Commercial) to an HDR (High Density Residential) land use designation to include all DRC comments based on the findings that; 1) although the current area plan states that it's a commercial zone, its original intent was to be high density residential. We recognize that the original area plan involved high density in this area; 2) that this request is not inconsistent, but in fact is consistent, with the standard planning methodologies; and 3) that the development of this property into high density residential will attract other projects, commercial, business, that will be more suitable for the area and areas surrounding the development will attract major Commercial projects. and to authorize the Mayor to sign the ordinance was made by Council member Dixon, seconded by Council member Holbrook.

Council member Revill asked if there should be something in there about the park amenities.

*Council member Dixon amended the motion to include that the park impact fees are set aside for the city to use in areas that warrant their use. He added that park impact fees are essentially used all over the city, wherever there are places of deficiency. It is warranted that the impact fees that may/will be generated (they may not be \$1.2 million), that this area is warranted for the use of equivalent impact fee to that amount. And the donation of land to the city as reported by the developer.

Council member Johnson asked that the park acreage be specified.

*Council member Dixon amended the motion to add that the city is making an attempt to rise to the deficiency to get to 11.5 acres. The donation should represent property of 11.5 acres.

Council member Holbrook recommended that it be consistent with the Parks Master Plan.

*Council member Dixon motioned to include to the motion that it be consistent with the Parks Master Plan in the city.

*Motion was made to second the inclusion of those items as amended to the motion by Council member Holbrook.

Roll call vote: Revill-no, Dixon-yes, Johnson-no, Holbrook-yes, Collins-excused. The motion ended in a tie. Mayor Wilson was asked to break the tie vote. Mayor Wilson voted yes to approve the request. Motion passed 2-yes, 2-no, 1-excused, mayor-yes.

Regular Session

2. Community Awards

There were no community awards at this time.

3. 20 Minute Citizen Input

Kelly Taeoalii – Traverse Mountain Community Council, indicated that they just found out that an additional crossing guard will be placed by the school and thanked the council. She reported that the trucks coming out of Fox Canyon continue to be a safety concern and asked if they can be re-routed. She noted that she will be emailing a student neighborhood document to Council member Johnson tomorrow for those students walking routes within a mile radius. She added that the bottom of Fox Canyon road has no crossing guard. She thanked the council for time and effort.

Lt. Darren Paul indicated that in speaking with neighbors, the principal and others about putting a crossing guard at Fox Canyon crossing they have determined that 2 areas will be manned with crossing guards with notice signs prior to the crossings. The major key is educating the students. He explained the planned routes for the children to take to school. Several parents were present expressing their concern that Winter Haven area has no sidewalk and also the concern for the traffic flow that goes one way when dropping kids off at school. They also noted that there are 10 schools of which 6 are close to the construction project.

Shauna Jones indicated that she sent emails to the Mayor and city council last week and has been in touch with UDOT regarding a stop light on 2300 west. She indicated that she did not get a response to her emails. She reported that she scheduled a meeting with UDOT to discuss getting a light on 2300 West. UDOT did come down and we were told that we would get a light on 2300 west. Mayor expressed his surprise indicating that after a warrant study was performed for the city for a signal they were turned down on that intersection. She also inquired why she could not find the minutes on the web site.

4. Lehi City – Request for approval of an Ordinance Repealing Title 10 of the Lehi City Municipal Code and adopting a new Title 10 – Vehicles and Traffic.

Alma Owens and Robert Marshal appeared before the council indicating that they made the changes that were recommended at the last city council meeting and presented the final draft document for approval. **MOTION:** a motion to approve Ordinance repealing Title 10 of the Lehi City Municipal Code and adopting a new Title 10-Vehicles and Traffic with the changes presented was made by Council member Dixon, seconded by Council member Johnson. Roll call vote: Revill-yes, Dixon-yes, Johnson-yes, Holbrook-yes, Collins-excused. Motion passed 4-yes, 1-excused. Passed. 4-yes.

5. Action on public hearing items

Motions/Actions are recorded on the public hearing portion of the minutes.

6. **City Business**

Administrator Davidson indicated that they recently had a meeting with MAG on the SR-92 trail. There is funding from the State of Utah that will bring approximately \$400,000.00 to be used towards the trail under the bridge. They anticipate the bridge to be completed by October 10th.

Council member Johnson reported that he would like the city council to take a field trip to the Pleasant Grove Pressurized Irrigation Pond.

Council member Dixon indicated that he recently attended a Public Works Meeting and expressed his appreciation for their diligence and hard work.

Council member Holbrook commended Ms. Jones for getting a light committed at 2300 West and Pioneer Crossing; he explained that the city has been working on this for several years to no avail.

7. **Minutes approval**

MOTION: a motion was made by Council member Revill to approve the minutes with the correction of the name Haco to Jaco in item number 7, seconded by Council member Johnson. Motion passed 4-yes, 1-excused –Collins.

8. **Adjournment**

MOTION: a motion to adjourn was made by Council member Holbrook, seconded by Council member Johnson, motion passed 4-yes, 1-excused – Collins. Meeting adjourned at 9:44 p.m.